REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 53-75 are pending.

Claims 1-13 and 53-75 stand rejected.

Claims 63, 68 and 69 have been amended to correct typographical informalities.

Claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, 53-63, 65, and 67-75 have been amended.

Claim Objection

Claim 68 is objected to for having an extra period. Claim 68 has been amended to delete the second period.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-10, 58, 62-66, and 70-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383 to Henson (hereinafter "*Henson*").

In general, *Henson* teaches that, "A web-based online store includes a configurator, a cart, a checkout, and a database, further in which a user interface of the online store enables a custom configuration of a computer system according to an identification of a user belonging to a prescribed customer set." *Henson*, Abstract. Fig. 5 of *Henson* depicts a web page 102. The "all option" configurator view of Fig. 5 presents various feature options for a computer system product and the affect of the selection on the current configured price. See, *Henson*, col. 9, lines 9-25. For example, selection of 128MB SDRAM adds $60 to the Configured Price of $2,307 and selection of 64MB SDRAM with ECC subtracts $40 from the Configured Price. See *Henson*, Fig. 5.

Henson further teaches that a "customer of the online store 10 can build a customer configured machine by selecting from options listed on the configuration screen 70." *Id.*, col. 6, lines 19-21 and Fig. 3. However, in contrast to the present invention, *Henson* does not teach "receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user" as required by claims 1, 58, and 75. Although *Henson* presents multiple options for multiple features to the user (e.g. in Fig. 5, multiple memory, hard drive, and monitor options), the radio buttons only allow for one

configuration of the product (Dell Dimension XPS R) to be selected by the user at any given time. Thus, *Henson* fails to teach that "first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user." Claims 1, 58, and 75

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Henson* fails to teach or suggest "generat[ing] a price of a second configuration of the product in response to the received second configuration of the product." *Id.*

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Henson* fails to teach or suggest "provid[ing] the modified price, *t*he delta price, and the price of the second configuration of the product to a computer system of a user to indicate to the user a pricing impact associated with the modification of the configuration and a comparison of the modified price of the first configuration and the price of the second configuration of the product. *Id.*

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 58, and 75 are allowable over *Henson*. For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1 and 58 are allowable over *Henson*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 11-13, 59-61, and 67-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Henson* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088431 to Hara et al. (hereinafter "*Hara*").

Hara relates to an "automatic price correcting system in which the seller and the buyer communicate with each other via network." *Hara*, Abstract. Applicants respectfully submit that, like *Henson*, *Hara* also does not teach "receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user" as required by claims 1, 58, and 75. For example, Figs. 6-9 of *Hara* each teach one configuration of "Commodity A" received at a one time.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that *Henson* in view of *Hara* fails to teach or suggest "generat[ing] a price of a second configuration of the product in response to the received second configuration of the product." *Id.*

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Henson* in view of *Hara* fails to teach or

suggest "provid[ing] the modified price, *t*he delta price, and the price of the second configuration of the product to a computer system of a user to indicate to the user a pricing impact associated with the modification of the configuration and a comparison of the modified price of the first configuration and the price of the second configuration of the product. *Id.*

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 58, and 75 are allowable over *Henson* in view of *Hara*. For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 11-13, 59-61, and 67-69, directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1 and 58, are allowable over *Henson* in view of *Hara*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

<table>
<tr><td>FILED ELECTRONICALLY
August 28, 2007</td></tr>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839